

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 and 31-40 are pending. Claims 4, 5, 10, 14-21 and 31 are amended. Claims 32-40 are new. Due to a numbering error, the previously second listed claim 15 has been renumbered to 16. The following claims have been renumbered to reflect this correction.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 14-15 and 22-30 stand objected to because of various informalities. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

35 U.S.C § 112 Rejections

Claims 4, 5, 10, 15, and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicants have amended the claims to obviate this rejection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 101 Rejections

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 21 is directed towards statutory subject matter. The Examiner states “[a]s computer readable medium can be signal wave (i.e. wireless medium) along (Specification, [0074]), wherein signal wave is non-statutory subject matter.” However, “signal” is not a term used in the specification. The specification states:

When information is transferred or provided over a network or another communications connection (either hardwired, wireless, or combination thereof) to a computer, the computer properly views **the connection as a computer-readable medium**. Thus, any such **connection is properly termed a computer-readable medium**. Specification, para. [0074] (emphasis added).

This connection, for example in a distributed computing environment, may be described as “local and remote processing devices that are linked (either by hardwired links, wireless links, or by a combination thereof) through a communications network.” Specification, para. [0076].

Thus, a connection involves the use of such devices to store and subsequently process the claimed instructions. Even if the information transferred or provided over wireless medium is accomplished via a signal wave, a medium that stores such a signal is statutory subject matter. See *In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346 (Fed. Cir. 2007). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections

Claims 1-21 and 31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Scheifler (U.S. Patent No. 6,138,238) in view of Colburn et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,404). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Scheifler does not teach each and every element of the claims. In fact, Scheifler teaches away from the present invention as claimed. Scheifler discloses a security mechanism “based on the source and executor of the code currently being executed.” Col. 8, lines 1-2. Scheifler describes an implementation of its invention using “permission objects and protection domain objects to store information that models the security policy of a system.” Col. 8, lines 24-27. The protection domains are “a set of permission granted to **one or more executors** when code from one or more sources is being executed on their behalf.” Col. 11, lines 24-26 (emphasis added). Scheifler also discloses the use of permission objects “which determine whether a requested permission is authorized by the particular permission represented by the permission object.” Col. 11, lines 56-57. The policy of the system is “represented by one or more files containing instructions.” Col. 11, lines 62-63. Each of these aspects of the security system represent a design that requires “significant centralized knowledge of all system-wide security policies, data and policy duplication between secured components and the central authority that implements the policies, and constant communication between the central authority and objects in the system, both of which are undesirable in a dynamic, scalable, open system.” (Specification, para. [0009], lines 12-16). In other words, Scheifler represents the problems Applicants are addressing.

Scheifler is incapable of teaching the elements of, for example, claim 1. Scheifler does not teach receiving a call from an external object to a first interface of a target object as claimed. For example, the Examiner cites Figs. 4 & 5 as teaching the above element. However, these

figures reveal a centralized architecture whereby permissions or other security details are obtained from a permission object, and not the target object. Consequently, Scheifler cannot disclose a determination of access at the target object or granting access according to the determination as claimed. As such, for these reasons alone, any combination involving Scheifler cannot teach or suggest the present claims.

Colburn does not cure Scheifler's deficiencies. Colburn does not teach "at the target object, determining whether the external object has access to other interfaces of the target object based on the call to the first interface." Colburn addresses system security "by imposing conditions on the accessing of targets by **accessing instances** according to the attributes in the stack of calls or procedures, or call stack, representing interactions between object instances." (Col. 8, lines 61-64; see also col. 8, line 64 – col 10, line 25). As such, the combination with Scheifler does not teach or suggest each and every element of the present claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection for claims 1-21 and 31.

New Claims

Applicant is introducing new claims 32-40, which recite similar limitations to claims 22-30 that were withdrawn in response to a restriction requirement. These claims now depend on claims 1 and 21 respectively, and therefore fall under the classification Group I. These dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art for the same reasons as argued above with respect to independent claims 1 and 21.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly addressed. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the outstanding rejections. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned representative if an interview might expedite allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,
BERRY& ASSOCIATES P.C.

Dated: February 8, 2009

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860

By: /Shawn Diedtrich/
Shawn Diedtrich
Registration No. 58,176
Direct: 480.704.4615